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Reviewer's report:

General

Further details on why individuals with diabetes were excluded are needed – this is likely a significant group of individuals.

The use of missing final scores being replaced with the baseline value for a particular subject is problematic. More appropriate methodology such as data imputation is available.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

It is not clear why the University of York was requested to approve this study and not a local institution in Shanghai.

The language of the paper needs to be improved. There are a number of awkward sentences.

A table is presented to describe the intervention, but there lacks adequate description of the intervention.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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